UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/582,281	06/09/2006	Rob Beltman	F7745(V)	2927
201 7590 02/24/2010 UNILEVER PATENT GROUP 800 SYLVAN AVENUE			EXAMINER	
			PADEN, CAROLYN A	
AG West S. Wing ENGLEWOOD CLIFFS, NJ 07632-3100			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1794	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/24/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentgroupus@unilever.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/582,281	BELTMAN ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Carolyn A. Paden	1794				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period v - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>12 N</u>	ovember 2009					
	action is non-final.					
· -						
closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>11 and 15-27</u> is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>11, 15-17, 19-21, 24, 26, 27</u> is/are rej	ected.					
7)⊠ Claim(s) <u>18,22,23 and 25</u> is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	r					
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
<u>-</u>	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)	-(d) or (f)				
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:						
1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary	(PTO-413)				
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P					
Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	αιστι πρριισαιιστ				

Art Unit: 1794

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 11, 15-17, 19-21, 24, 26 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pardums (3,245,802) in view of Anderson taken with Hall.

Pardums discloses washing soybeans and then drying them in a vacuum. The soybeans were then ground to pass a 50 mesh sieve. It is the examiners understanding that a 50 mesh screen would include a screen size of about .297 mm. Then the soybean powder was extracted with alcohol and then hexane to remove substantially all of the oil in the product (column 2, lines 25-41. Then margarine was made that contained the treated soy flour. Pardums describes the soybean flour as an additive at column 1, lines 67-68 and further indicates that the additive may be added to the aqueous phase, the fat phase or to the emulsion at the top of column 2. The soybean flour was used in amounts shown at column 3,

Application/Control Number: 10/582,281

Art Unit: 1794

Table 1. Table II shows that the addition of soy flour improves the antispattering properties of margarine. The claims appear to differ from Pardums in the recitation that the margarine is water in oil emulsion. Given the fact that Pardums only contains 19.8% water, one of ordinary skill in the art would expect the margarine to be water in oil emulsion. It is appreciated that particle sizes of .1 mm and .04 mm are not mentioned but one of ordinary skill in the art could further grind the soy flour of Pardums

to create finer flour. The claims also appear to differ from Pardums in the

indication of a process step that includes pressure. Anderson teaches that

the Astra pressure cooler and the Astra homogenizer utilize pressure

Page 3

during processing. Hall is cited to show that it is known in the art to vary the pressure used in homogenization to alter the size of the fat globules in an emulsion (see Table H8). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply pressure in the process of Pardums as a part of margarine manufacture as shown by Anderson and Hall.

Claims 18, 22, 23 and 25 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The rejection of the claims over van Buuren and Sipila has been withdrawn.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Carolyn A Paden whose telephone number is (571) 272-1403. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 7 am to 3:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Keith Hendricks can be reached by dialing 571-272-1401. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Application/Control Number: 10/582,281 Page 5

Art Unit: 1794

/Carolyn Paden/

Primary Examiner 1794